In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

Criminal Misc. No.74707-M of 2006

.....

Date of decision: 4.12.2006

Harwinder Singh

.....Petitioner

v.

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

....

Present: Mr. S.S. Majithia, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Veneet Sharma, Advocate for the complainant.

.....

S.S. Saron, J.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the FIR has been registered against the petitioner by his uncle so as to pressurize him to part with his property. It is further contended that Inderjit Kaur wife of the petitioner with whom the petitioner is now not having good relations has been granted anticipatory bail. Therefore, the petitioner is also entitled to the concession of pre-arrest bail.

After giving my thoughtful consideration to the matter, I find no merit in the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner. The allegations against the petitioner as made by the complainant are that the petitioner and his wife were living with him. After retirement, the complainant purchased Kisan Vikas Patras worth Rs.5,30,000/-. The said Kisan Vikas Patras were replaced by the petitioner with duplicate ones which

could not be got encashed. The fact that the wife of the petitioner has been granted concession of pre-arrest bail is not of much consequence as it is the petitioner who is the nephew of the complainant and investigation with regard to the replacement of the Kisan Vikas Patras is to be carried out.

In the circumstances, no ground for grant of pre-arrest bail is made out. Dismissed.

December 4, 2006. **(S.S. Saron)**
Judge

hsp